

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JAMAAL MCNEIL,

Defendant.

4:24CR3048

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Now pending before the Court are multiple motions filed by *pro se* Defendant Jamaal McNeil. ([Filing No. 425](#); [Filing No. 426](#); [Filing No. 431](#); [Filing No. 434](#); [Filing No. 435](#); [Filing No. 437](#); [Filing No. 438](#); [Filing No. 439](#); [Filing No. 440](#).) Defendant's "petition for extraordinary" writ filed in the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals was denied and dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction ([Filing No. 441](#)), and the Mandate has issued. ([Filing No. 442](#).) Therefore, this Court will take up Defendant's pending motions at this time.

Defendant has filed a motion requesting a hearing ([Filing No. 425](#)) and a "Motion to Reopen the Extension Motion Deadline" ([Filing No. 426](#)). These motions request that the pretrial motion deadline be extended and that the trial date be continued. Defendant apparently wants a hearing to discuss these extensions and the Court's reconsideration of earlier rulings.

As Defendant was previously advised, the deadline and parameters for pretrial motions will not be changed. ([Filing No. 424](#).) The trial date was previously continued and will not be moved again. Also, as Defendant was already advised, the Court stands by, and will not reconsider, its earlier rulings in this case. ([Filing No. 424](#).) If Defendant wants to appeal the rulings of this Court, he may do so after trial in accordance with proper rules and procedures. Therefore, these motions are denied, as is Defendant's motion for reconsideration ([Filing No. 438](#)), motion to alter/amend/modify the judgment ([Filing No. 437](#)), and motion in limine ([Filing No. 439](#)), which all seek reconsideration of issues (including those pertaining to suppression of evidence) already decided by the Court.

Defendant has filed several other motions requesting relief that has already been denied by the Court, including a motion to return and release property ([Filing No. 434](#)), motion to strike ([Filing No. 435](#)), and a “Motion to Dissolve All No Notice Injunctions.” ([Filing No. 440](#).) Nothing has changed since the Court denied Defendant’s earlier motions on these topics, and the Court will not reconsider its rulings. Therefore, these latest motions are denied.


Finally, Defendant has requested leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). ([Filing No. 431](#).) Defendant was previously appointed counsel based on his indigent status, but he elected to decline representation and proceed *pro se*. Standby counsel has been appointed for Defendant and he remains available to Defendant and can represent Defendant should he decide to be represented by an attorney. Therefore, Defendant’s motion to proceed IFP ([Filing No. 431](#)) is denied.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant’s motions ([Filing No. 425](#); [Filing No. 426](#); [Filing No. 431](#); [Filing No. 434](#); [Filing No. 435](#); [Filing No. 437](#); [Filing No. 438](#); [Filing No. 439](#); [Filing No. 440](#)) are denied.

Dated this 4th day of August, 2025.

BY THE COURT:


Susan M. Bazis
United States District Judge